



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,057	10/31/2003	Brian Joseph Dillenburg	PB 03 0006	2573
7590		01/18/2007	EXAMINER	
Dean D. Small			YAARY, MICHAEL D	
Armstrong teasdale LLP			ART UNIT	
Suite 2600			PAPER NUMBER	
One Metropolitan Square			2193	
St. Louis, MO 63102				
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/18/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/699,057

Applicant(s)

DILLENBURG ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Yaary

Art Unit

2196

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/31/2003 and 04/01/2004.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2196

Detailed Action

1. Claims 1-33 are pending in the application.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 13, line 1 the specification reads, "to obtain EPSs 38 and 40." This is a typographical error, as figure 1 and the remainder of the specification discloses "EFSs 38 and 40."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 7, 10, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mutchler et al. (hereafter Mutchler)(US Pat. 6,889,157).

Art Unit: 2196

Regarding claim 1, Mutchler discloses a method for distributing software components to computer stations that analyze products (abstract), said method comprising:

Obtaining a software component including information used by a computer station which communicates with a test station to analyze a product (Unit under test (UUT) 100 of figure 9. and column 1, lines 28-39 disclose using a network to obtain files from a server in order to run tests); and

Distributing the software component to the computer station automatically based on at least one of an identification of the test station and an identification of the product (Column 1, lines 42-55).

Regarding claim 7, Mutchler discloses downloading at the computer station at least one of a communication file, a configuration file, a calibration file, a test executive file, a test sequence file, a specification file, and a test step execution file (Column 4, lines 38-42 disclose a configuration file).

Regarding claim 10, Mutchler discloses analyzing at least one of a printed circuit board assembly, a combination of the printed circuit board assemblies, a module, a circuit pack, a field replaceable unit (FRU), a processor, a memory, and a cable (Unit under test 105 of figure 9).

Regarding claim 12, Mutchler discloses accessing, by computer station, a management file server to download software component updates (column 1, lines 43-56).

Art Unit: 2196

5. Claims 15, 17-19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kittross et al. (hereafter Kittross)(US Pat. 6,681,351).

Regarding claim 15, Kittross discloses a management system database configured to be used with a computer station that operates an instrument (test interface 28 of figure 1) when analyzing a product (test devices 46-1 – 46-X and test element database 36 of figure 1; abstract, lines 1-3; and column 12, lines 40-41), the database storing software components that are configured to be executed by the computer station to communicate with and operate the instrument in order to analyze the product (Column 4, lines 7-12 and 32-38 disclose software components, test elements, used to define a specific task or way for the device under test to be analyzed.), said database automatically accessing said software components based on identification of at least one of the computer station, the instrument (test interface 28 of figure 1) and the product (test devices 46-1 – 46-X of figure 1; column 1, lines 26-42 and 52-55; Column 7, lines 43-47 disclose how each particular test element or procedure has the appropriate specific information needed to perform a unique test, thus accessing the necessary software components when recognizing a particular product to be tested.).

Regarding claim 21, Kittross discloses a system comprising:

A computer station configured to control operation of an instrument (test interface 28 of figure 1) as the instrument analyzes a product (test devices 46-1 – 46-X of figure 1, automatic test equipment system (ATE) 20 of figure 1, and abstract lines 1-10), said computer station controlling the instrument based on at least one of an equipment file set and a test program set (column 4, lines 7-12 and 55-58); and

A management system database in communication with said computer station (test interface 28 of figure 1), said database storing said at least one of an equipment file set and test program set (column 4, lines 7-9), said database being accessible by said computer station (test element database 36 of figure 1 is shown as a part of the ATE system of the computer station), wherein said computer station controls said instrument (test element database 36 of figure 1) during analysis of the product (test devices 46-1 – 46-X of figure 1) based on said at least one of an equipment file set and a test program set (column 4, lines 55-58).

Regarding claim 28, Kittross discloses a system for developing software components (abstract, lines 1-10), said system comprising:

A test station communicating with a computer station (Abstract, lines 1-10 disclose an automatic test equipment system (ATE) consisting of an instrument connected to, and in communication with a computer.); and

A source code control system permitting a user to develop software components that, when used by said computer station, directs said computer station to control an instrument (test interface 28 of figure 1) during analysis of a product (test devices 46-1 – 46-X of figure 1), wherein said source code control system is used to develop a relation between an identification of the test station and an identification of the product (Column 3, lines 58-62; column 4, lines 7-12; and column 10, lines 8-18 disclose a test program builder and how the computer has capabilities of instructing an instrument of a test station to perform specific testing on a particular device, as a result developing a relation between a test station and its respective product being tested) .

Art Unit: 2196

Regarding claim 22, Kittross discloses said test program set includes a set of software components that are specific to the product and associated with at least one of said computer station and said instrument (column 3, lines 58-62).

Regarding claims 17 and 33, Kittross discloses said software components are organized into at least one test program set that defines a product specific test solution to be executed by the computer station to direct the instrument (test interface 28 of figure 1) to perform a test solution on the product (test devices 46-1 – 46-X of figure 1), said test program set being uniquely associated with the product, said test program set being associated with the instrument and the computer station (column 4, lines 7-12 and 55-58).

Regarding claims 18 and 25, Kittross discloses said software components correspond to at least one of a communication file, a configuration file, a calibration file, a test executive file, a test sequence file, a specification file, and a test step execution file (Column 4, lines 50-54 disclose obtaining instructions for testing, thus a test step execution file).

Regarding claims 19 and 24, Kittross discloses said software components are configured to control the computer station to analyze at least one of a printed circuit board assembly, a combination of printed circuit board assemblies, a module, a circuit pack, a field replaceable unit (FRU), a processor, a memory, and a cable (Column 4, lines 17-19 disclose testing a circuit board.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mutchler as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Proskauer.

Regarding claim 2, Mutchler discloses obtaining files used for testing at the computer station by means of a server (column 1, lines 28-31). But Mutchler does not disclose the obtaining being done by downloading, to the computer station, an equipment file set including said software component, said equipment file set directing the computer station to operate an instrument, said equipment file set being uniquely associated with the computer station and independent of the product.

However, Proskauer discloses an equipment file set including said software component, said equipment file set directing the computer station to operate an instrument, said equipment file set being uniquely associated with the computer station and independent of the product (Column 5, line 66-column 6, line 4 disclose individual driver software (equipment file set) associated with handlers (instruments) used for operation in a particular workstation, regardless of the product tested.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mutchler, by associating specific drivers for different

Art Unit: 2196

equipment handlers at different workstations as taught by Proskauer, for the benefit of creating smaller and more simple driver modules for instrument control (Proskauer column 6, lines 5-6).

Regarding claim 3, Mutchler does not disclose an instrument used to test the product and said obtaining step comprises downloading at the computer station an equipment file set including said software component, said equipment file set directing the computer station to analyze the product, said equipment file set being uniquely associated with the computer station and the instrument and said equipment file set being independent of the product.

However, Proskauer discloses an instrument used to test the product (handler 2004 of figure 2) and said obtaining step comprises downloading at the computer station an equipment file set including said software component, said equipment file set directing the computer station to analyze the product, said equipment file set being uniquely associated with the computer station and the instrument and said equipment file set being independent of the product (Column 5, line 66-column 6, line 4 disclose individual driver software (equipment file set) associated with handlers (instruments) used for operating the instrument in a particular workstation, thus controlling and analyzing the product, regardless of what product is tested.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mutchler, by including an instrument to test the product and associating specific drivers for different equipment handlers at different workstations as taught by Proskauer, for the benefit of effectively producing a testing system and

Art Unit: 2196

creating smaller and more simple driver modules for instrument control (Proskauer column 6, lines 5-6).

8. Claims 4-6, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mutchler as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kittross.

Regarding claim 4, Mutchler discloses obtaining files used for testing at the computer station by means of a server (column 1, lines 28-31). But Mutchler does not disclose the obtaining being done by downloading at the computer station a test program set, said test program set directing the computer station to analyze the product, and said test program set being uniquely associated with the product and being associated with the computer station.

However, Kittross discloses at the computer station a test program set, said test program set directing the computer station to analyze the product, and said test program set being uniquely associated with the product and being associated with the computer station (column 4, lines 7-12 and 55-58).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mutchler by, including a test program set as taught by Kittross, for the benefit of not having the burden of writing instructions from scratch.

Regarding claim 5, Mutchler discloses an instrument is used to test the product (user interface 10 of figure 1),

Mutchler does not disclose that said obtaining step comprises downloading at the computer station a test program set, said test program set directing the computer

Art Unit: 2196

station to analyze the product, and said test program set being uniquely associated with the product and being associated with the computer station and the instrument.

However, Kittross discloses that an instrument is used to test the product (column 6, lines 45-47), said obtaining step comprises downloading at the computer station a test program set, said test program set directing the computer station to analyze the product, and said test program set being uniquely associated with the product and being associated with the computer station and the instrument (column 4, lines 7-12 and 55-58).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mutchler by, including an instrument to test the product and obtaining a test program set as taught by Kittross, for the benefit of effectively producing a testing system and not having the burden of writing instructions from scratch.

Regarding claim 6, Mutchler discloses testing the product with an instrument based on the software component (user interface 10 of figure 1).

Mutchler does not disclose wherein the instrument is at least one of a power supply, a communication analyzer, a signal generator, and a frequency counter.

However, Kittross discloses testing the product with an instrument based on the software component, wherein the instrument is at least one of a power supply, a communication analyzer, a signal generator, and a frequency counter (column 11, lines 25-30 disclose a power supply).

Art Unit: 2196

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mutchler by, including a power supply as taught by Kittross, to effectively implement the testing system.

Regarding claim 11, Mutchler does not disclose storing, in a database, multiple test program sets, each of which includes at least one test step execution file that identifies steps to be executed by an instrument configured to test the product, wherein said obtaining step comprises accessing the test step execution file.

However, Kittross discloses storing, in a database, multiple test program sets (column 4, lines 7-12), each of which includes at least one test step execution file that identifies steps to be executed by an instrument configured to test the product, wherein said obtaining step comprises accessing the test step execution file (column 3, lines 58-66).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mutchler by, storing test program sets in a database as taught by Kittross, for the benefit of being able to retrieve the test operations easily and efficiently.

9. Claims 13 and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mutchler as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Blitz.

Regarding claim 13, Mutchler does not disclose storing a relationship between the software components, products, instruments, and computer stations.

However, Blitz discloses storing a relationship between the software components, products, instruments, and computer stations (Column 5, lines 54-55 and column 6, lines 11-13 and 38-42 disclose different types of information being stored regarding the Excel workbook. Also it is mentioned that the spreadsheets contain all data required for a test, thus making it obvious that relationship data regarding products, instruments, and computer stations would be necessary as they are relevant pieces of information needed for testing.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mutchler by, storing relationships regarding different components of the test system as taught by Blitz, for the benefit of creating an efficient and organized means of accessing relevant information necessary for product testing.

Regarding claim 14, Mutchler does not disclose storing in database information identifying multiple products, test stations used to test each product, instruments used to test the products, and fixtures used to hold the products.

However, Blitz discloses storing in database information identifying multiple products, test stations used to test each product, instruments used to test the products, and fixtures used to hold the products (Data manager 316 in figure 2, and column 5, lines 54-56 disclose how all required data regarding testing is stored in the data manger, thus being obvious that test station, instrument, and fixture information would be included as their data are required pieces of information necessary for testing.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mutchler by incorporating a data manager storing

Art Unit: 2196

relevant testing information as taught by Blitz, for the benefit of creating an efficient and organized means of accessing relevant information necessary for product testing.

10. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mutchler as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kittross and Proskauer.

Regarding claim 8, Mutchler does not disclose that an instrument is used to test the product and further comprising storing in a database multiple equipment file sets, each equipment file set including at least one file identifying communications protocols between the computer station, the product and the instrument used to test the product.

However, Kittross discloses that an instrument is used to test the product (column 6, lines 45-47) and a database for storing software components (test element database 36 of figure 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mutchler by, incorporating an instrument and a database for use in the test system as taught by Kittross, for the benefit of successfully generating the necessary means of operations in a test system environment.

Mutchler and Kittross do not disclose storing in a database multiple equipment file sets, each equipment file set including at least one file identifying communications protocols between the computer station, the product and the instrument used to test the product.

However, Proskauer discloses multiple equipment file sets (Column 5, line 66- column 6, line 4 disclose individual driver software (equipment file set) associated with

Art Unit: 2196

handlers (instruments) used for operating the instrument in a particular workstation, thus controlling and analyzing the product), each equipment file set including at least one file identifying communications protocols between the computer station, the product and the instrument used to test the product (Column 6, lines 21-27 and lines 34-39 disclose the way communication is done in the test station environment, thus providing a communications protocol.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mutchler and Kittross, by having equipment file sets including communication protocols for the testing system as taught by Proskauer, for the benefit of successfully running multiple types of tests and making sure proper synchronization is attained between all elements of the testing system.

Regarding claim 9, Mutchler does not disclose storing in a database multiple equipment file sets, each equipment file set including at least one file identifying a calibration for an instrument to be used by the computer station to analyze the product.

However, Kittross discloses a database for storing multiple software components (test element database 36 of figure 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to modify Mutchler, by including a database for the benefit of maintaining organization of the different types of software components used in a testing system.

Mutchler and Kittross do not disclose that being stored are multiple equipment file sets, and each equipment file set including at least one file identifying a calibration for an instrument to be used by the computer station to analyze the product.

Art Unit: 2196

However, Proskauer discloses multiple equipment file sets (Column 5, line 66-column 6, line 4 disclose individual driver software (equipment file set) associated with handlers (instruments) used for operating the instrument in a particular workstation, thus controlling and analyzing the product), and each equipment file set including at least one file identifying a calibration for an instrument to be used by the computer station to analyze the product (Column 6, lines 24-27 disclose programming the handler (instrument) appropriately, thus calibrating accordingly for testing).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mutchler and Kittross, by including equipment file sets to calibrate and control test instruments as taught by Proskauer, for the benefit of successfully being able to implement the instrument and test station to perform multiple arrays of testing.

11. Claims 16, 20, 23, 29, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kittross as applied to claim 15, 21, and 28 above, and further in view of Proskauer (US Pat. 5,828,674).

Regarding claim 16 and 32, Kittross does not disclose said software components are organized into at least one equipment file set defining a station specific test solution to be executed by the computer station to direct the instrument to perform a test solution, said equipment file set being uniquely associated with the computer station and the instrument, said equipment file set being independent of the product.

However, Proskauer discloses said software components are organized into at least one equipment file set defining a station specific test solution to be executed by the computer station to direct the instrument to perform a test solution, said equipment

Art Unit: 2196

file set being uniquely associated with the computer station and the instrument, said equipment file set being independent of the product (Column 5, line 66-column 6, line 4 disclose individual driver software (equipment file set) associated with handlers (instruments) used for operation in a particular workstation, thus allowing the instrument to perform a particular testing solution, regardless of what product is being tested.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kittross by, associating specific drivers to direct the different equipment handlers at different workstations as taught by Proskauer, for the benefit of allowing the testing done at the station by the automatic testing equipment to not be dependent on the specific product.

Regarding claim 20, Kittross does not disclose said software components define an equipment file set that, when executed by the computer station, calibrates an instrument to execute a test sequence.

However, Proskauer discloses said software components define an equipment file set that, when executed by the computer station, calibrates an instrument to execute a test sequence (Column 6, lines 24-27 disclose programming the handler (instrument) appropriately, thus calibrating accordingly for testing).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kittross by, programming the handler appropriately for a particular test as taught by Proskauer, for the benefit of efficiently executing a product test.

Regarding claim 23, Kittross discloses a test station communicating with said computer station and said instrument (Abstract, lines 1-10 disclose an automatic test equipment system (ATE) consisting of an instrument connected to, and in communication with a computer.)

Kittross does not disclose said equipment file set including a set of software components associated with said test station and independent of said product.

However, Proskauer discloses said equipment file set including a set of software components associated with said test station and independent of said product (Column 5, line 66-column 6, line 4 disclose individual driver software (equipment file set) associated with handlers (instruments) used for operation in a particular workstation regardless of the product tested).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kittross by, associating specific drivers for different equipment handlers at different workstations as taught by Proskauer, for the benefit of creating smaller and more simple driver modules for instrument control (Proskauer column 6, lines 5-6).

Regarding claim 29, Kittross discloses a test program set that is uniquely associated with said product and associated with said test station (Column 4, lines 7-12 disclose tests elements containing instructions to perform specific test on corresponding products to be tested.).

Kittross does not disclose an equipment file set that is uniquely associated with said test station and independent of said product.

Art Unit: 2196

However, Proskauer discloses an equipment file set that is uniquely associated with said test station and independent of said product (Column 5, line 66-column 6, line 4 disclose individual driver software (equipment file set) associated with handlers (instruments) used for operation in a particular workstation, thus allowing the instrument to perform a particular testing solution that is independent of the product.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kittross by, including an equipment file set that is uniquely associated with said test station and independent of said product as taught by Proskauer, for the benefit of effectively controlling the appropriate testing equipment.

12. Claims 26, 27, 30, and 31 and rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kittross as applied to claims 21 and 28 above, and further in view of Blitz (US Pat. 6,047,293).

Regarding claim 26, Kittross does not disclose a developer file that enables a user to track relationships between said instrument and computer station.

However, Blitz discloses a developer file that enables a user to track relationships between said instrument and computer station (Column 2, lines 50-54 discloses a workbook (developer file) containing nested levels of device parameter data, thus being capable of tracking relationships between instrument and computer station.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kittross by, incorporating a spreadsheet workbook for

Art Unit: 2196

tracking and maintaining data as taught by Blitz, for the benefit of efficiently increasing data retrieval speed during testing.

Regarding claim 27, Kittross does not disclose a pre-release tool that is used to release information generated in a developer file.

However, Blitz discloses a pre-release tool that is used to release information generated in a developer file (Column 4, lines 61-68 disclose passing information from the workbook (developer file) to be tested, thus releasing the information.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kittross by, releasing information from the workbook as taught by Blitz, for the benefit of efficiently executing the desired testing.

Regarding claim 30, Kittross discloses a database (test element database 36 of figure 1).

Kittross does not disclose a pre-release tool that parses a developer file created by the user to track relationships, wherein said pre-release tool parses to check for data items within said developer file with respect to pre-existing information within said database.

However, Blitz discloses a pre-release tool that parses a developer file created by the user to track relationships, wherein said pre-release tool parses to check for data items within said developer file with respect to pre-existing information within said database (Column 2, lines 54-67; and column 4, line 61-column 5, line 5 disclose a data manager storing and analyzing data broken down in the form of a tree and searching

Art Unit: 2196

the tree for particular data; as well as analyzing the workbook (developer file) for retrieval of appropriate information regarding the device for test.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kittross by, parsing a developer file as taught by Blitz, for the benefit of efficiently increasing data retrieval speed during testing.

Regarding claim 31, Kittross does not disclose a workbook configured to create equipment file sets and test program sets in connection with new solutions configured to test said product.

However, Blitz discloses a workbook configured to create equipment file sets and test program sets in connection with new solutions configured to test said product (Column 4, lines 8-12 disclose using an Excel workbook used for test development and analysis, thus making it obviously able to create the different file sets, such as EFS and TPS, needed for testing.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kittross by, implementing a workbook in the development of a testing system as taught by Blitz, for the benefit of creating an efficient and organized product testing system.

Art Unit: 2196


Conclusions

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Yaary whose telephone number is (571) 270-1249. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00 a.m - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nabil El-Hady can be reached on (571) 272-3963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MY
MP


NABIL M. EL-HADY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER